

REMARKS


Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of former dependent claim 3. Dependent claim 3 was rejected under Section 103, based on the combination of Kojima and Feldman. However, Kojima does some type of analysis to initially design the product. There is no indication of any type of software or hardware that does any type of determination of a color gamut that all the pixels can achieve or even substantially all. If such analysis is done, it appears that it is done by humans prior to implementing the product, as well as can be determined. Thus, Kojima has no way to make the gamut determination after the product leaves the factory and the parameters have been injected into the design.

While Feldman, which is not conceded to be prior art, does talk about some type of aging correction, he does not teach any type of system in which a color gamut for a substantial portion of the pixel is maintained. It would be a substantially different operation to automatically do what Kojima allegedly does by human intervention on an ongoing basis to maintain the gamut substantially constant over the lifetime of the display as the pixels change. Nothing in Feldman provides such a solution to a much more complex problem and Kojima does nothing to address that problem.

Therefore, the combination of references does not meet the method limitations of claim 1 as amended, the software limitations of claim 6 as amended, or the hardware limitations of claims 11 and 16 as amended.

In view of these remarks, the application should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Date: November 2, 2004